Technology Affordances — William W. Gaver

Keywords

Ecological Perspectives, Human Interface Design, Input/Output Design, Multimedia

---

Introduction

Gaver discusses the tension between tasks and technologies in interface design:

- Designs that focus mainly on **new technologies** often look sleek and technically sophisticated — but can be functionally awkward or disconnected from human use
- Designs that focus too narrowly on **current user tasks** may overlook innovations enabled by emerging technologies

Balance is essential:
Designers must understand both the needs and abilities of users and the capabilities and limitations of technologies to uncover the possibilities they offer for meaningful interaction.

This paper explores the concept of **affordances** as a framework for understanding how technologies enable or constrain human actions.

Theoretical Background: Gibson's Ecological Psychology

Gibson's Rejection of the Cognitive Model

Before Gibson, the cognitive psychology model dominated:

Perception was viewed as an internal mental process:

1. People receive sensations
2. Combine them with memories
3. Build symbolic representations of the world

4. Then act based on those representations

Gibson challenged this "representation-first" approach, calling it too abstract and detached from real-world behavior.

Ecological Approach

- Focuses on the **direct relationship** between people and their environments — perception is not just "in the head"
- Perception is **action-oriented**: we directly perceive opportunities for action in the environment

Example:
We don't just see a chair and mentally categorize it — we perceive it as something that affords sitting.

Implications for Design and Technology

- If designers think of users as merely processing abstract information, they risk ignoring how tools and environments shape behavior
- The concept of affordances helps designers attend to the **strengths and weaknesses of technologies in context** — how real people use them effectively (or not) in real-world scenarios

This is why HCI researchers, UX designers, and game developers use the idea of affordances:
It connects perception, design, and action.

Integrating Cognitive and Ecological Perspectives

Gaver argues that the most effective design perspective lies between the two extremes:

- **Purely cognitive models** are too abstract, overlooking physical and contextual influences
- **Purely ecological models** may ignore culture, symbolism, and learned conventions

Best approach: A hybrid model recognizing that humans are embodied beings who perceive and act in environments — but whose perceptions are also shaped by memory, culture, and experience.

Types of Affordances

1. Perceptible Affordances

- Clearly visible or otherwise perceivable cues for possible actions

- **Example:** A button that visually looks pressable

2. Hidden Affordances

- Real action possibilities that exist but are not easily perceived
- **Example:** A hidden shortcut key or an invisible swipe gesture

3. False Affordances

- Misleading cues suggesting actions that aren't actually possible
- **Example:** A decorative button that looks clickable but isn't interactive

Good design emphasizes perceptible affordances, reveals hidden ones, and eliminates false ones.

Complementarity

- Affordances depend on the **fit between the artifact and the user**
- **Example:** A cat door affords passage for a cat, not a human
- Affordances are therefore **relational** — neither entirely in the object nor entirely in the user

---

Complex Affordances

Sequential Affordances

- One affordance leads to another through a sequence of actions
- **Example:** Grabbing → turning → pulling a door handle
- These guide user exploration step-by-step

Nested Affordances

- Multiple affordances grouped together in space or structure
- **Example:** A handle nested in a door; a controller with multiple input zones
- Users perceive these affordances as part of a larger, integrated system

Sequential and nested affordances are especially relevant in interactive systems and games, where layered interactions create complexity and depth.

Cultural and Experiential Factors

- Culture and experience shape which affordances users notice, expect, or prioritize
- However, **affordances exist independently of perception**
- **Example:** A touchpad affords sliding, whether or not the user knows it yet
- Design must bridge the gap between existing affordances and what users perceive as possible

---

Multimodal Affordances

Affordances extend across multiple sensory modalities, not just vision.

	Example	Design Role
	Buttons that appear 3D or raised	Visual cue for pressing
	Tactile textures, handle grip, force feedback	Guides manipulation and realism
	Mouse click, latch snap, door creak	Provides confirmation and situational feedback

Effective interfaces use multisensory feedback to make affordances more perceptible and engaging.

Design Implications

Emphasize Desired Affordances

- Highlight clear cues for important actions
- Reduce ambiguity by making the intended interactions perceptible

Minimize False or Misleading Affordances

- Avoid decorative elements that look functional but aren't

Guide Exploration through Sequential or Nested Affordances

- Design for natural discovery: one action should reveal or suggest the next

Design Across Modalities (Visual, Auditory, Tactile)

- Combine sight, sound, and touch to create intuitive systems that communicate affordances clearly

Balance Cognitive and Ecological Approaches

- Combine physical, perceptual, and cultural insights in interface design
- Recognize both what a technology affords and what the user perceives

---

Summary / Main Points

- **Affordances** describe the action possibilities arising from the relationship between people and technology
- Gaver draws from Gibson's ecological psychology to argue that affordances are a more direct and practical design framework than symbolic cognitive models
- Affordances exist whether or not they are perceived, but for design to succeed, they must be **made perceptible**

Designers must avoid:

- **False affordances** (misleading cues)
- **Hidden affordances** (unseen but real possibilities)

Affordances vary in complexity:

- Simple (single action)
- Sequential (ordered actions)
- Nested (spatially grouped)
- **Affordances are multimodal:** they can be visual, tactile, or auditory
- Designers should aim for transparency, intuitiveness, and user-centered systems that balance:
    - Technological capability
    - Human perception and cultural understanding

Connection to My Research

Gaver's concept aligns directly with the goal of AI affordance prediction:

Understanding how shape, feedback, and material cues suggest possible actions to users.

In our **Game Affordance Net**, affordance detection can similarly analyze:

- **Geometry-based affordances** (shape enabling "sit," "grasp," "support")
- **Multimodal cues** (visual texture, sound, motion)
- **Cultural conventions** (genre-based expectations in games)

Just as Gaver argues for balancing human perception and technological capability, our **hybrid point→mesh ML pipeline** balances:

- **Computational inference** (geometry → affordance)
- **Human-centered design principles** (visibility, feedback, consistency)

Key Quotes to Remember

"Affordances focus attention on the strengths and weaknesses of technologies in context—how real people can or cannot use them effectively."

"Affordances exist whether or not they are perceived, but their effectiveness in design depends on how well they are made perceptible."

-
-